DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 409 JC 690 172

By-Cohen, Arthur M.; Gaddy, Dale

Research Within and Without the Junior College.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.

Pub Date Apr 69

Note-16p.

Journal Cit-Junior College Research Review; v3 n8 April 1969

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90

Descriptors-*Institutional Research, *Junior Colleges, *Research

This report contains two essays on the extent and import of current research for junior college personnel. Both authors write from the vantage point of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges at the University of California, Los Angeles. After surveying the literature inputs at the Clearinghouse, Cohen concludes that there is a serious lack of professional dialogue within the junior college. He isolates five general characteristics of current literature: (1) there is a posture of defensiveness, (2) much of the literature focuses on means, rather than ends, (3) there is a belief that the junior college can do nearly all jobs of community education, (4) the question of junior college identity is still unresolved, and (5) the most definitive examinations of the junior college are coming from writers outside the field. Cohen makes a plea for dialogue in depth and indicates significant issues in junior college education that deserve research. Gaddy explores the thesis that research outside the junior college has important implications for the junior college, and provides summaries of several research studies at UCLA to support his thesis. Sources of research information are listed. (JC)

EDO 30409

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
ERIC
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

Volume 3, Number 8

UCLA JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

April 1969

Published by the American Association of Junior Colleges

RESEARCH WITHIN AND WITHOUT THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

WHO IS TALKING TO WHOM?

The literature of the junior college as it relates to the "real" issues in the field.

By Arthur M. Cohen..... p. 2

THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER HAS SOMETHING TO SAY

Implications for the junior college from the UCLA Graduate School of Education's research activities in other fields.

By Dale Gaddy..... p. 9

NOTE:

This is the first expanded issue of the *Junior College Research Review*. Similar issues are planned for next autumn and winter.

Contributions are invited. Research reviews, reports of research projects completed or in progress, and articles in which research is synthesized are particularly solicited.

Manuscripts should be not less than five nor more than 16 typed pages, double-spaced. Submit two copies to the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 96 Powell Library Building, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024.

JC 690 172

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 19 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

WHO IS TALKING TO WHOM?

Arthur M. Cohen

University of California, Los Angeles

The literature of the junior college as it relates to the

The community junior college is in the unenviable position of being an institution about which little of substance is written. Although vaguely worded reports, platitudinous public relations releases, and tautological studies of minutiae abound, the *idea* of the community college is rarely examined in the contemporary professional literature. Between 40 and 70 years ago, Bogue, Jordan, Lange, Harper, Koos, and Eels set down guidelines for the development of a nationwide system of junior colleges. Did they say it all? What have been the effects of translating their dreams into one thousand institutions enrolling two million students? Do changed urban and societal conditions suggest a revision of their original intent to broaden the scope of higher education? What *is* the idea of the junior college and how has it been shaped by "community concepts"? These questions are rarely examined in depth by the current generation of college leaders.

The lack of significant dialogue within the profession has led to acute debilities. A most obvious concomitant is that, by leaving the field of institutional criticism unturned, junior college educators have allowed others — laymen, sociologists, and journalists, for example — to define for them how and why they should conduct their affairs. They remain constantly on the defensive. More important, the directions taken by individual colleges and by the institution as a whole remain unarticulated, hence, indeterminate. To be worthy of the name, an "educational" institution must engage in continual interpretation of its role, but the junior college does not enjoy that form of dialogue. And without it, institutional self-respect and directed-

real" issues in the field.

ness cannot mature. The irresolute institution fails to lead itself, let alone its community. Its practices vacillate, moved by the winds of fashion, not by a coherent philosophy.

A body of writing that appears in the form of theses and dissertations, unpublished reports, journal articles, and books is produced by people concerned with the community junior college as an educational force. Each of these forms of output addresses itself to a different class of problems — although there are considerable overlaps — and each is written by members of different groups within the field. Each has its own intended audience. This literature serves many purposes (even though it rarely addresses itself to encompassing concepts in junior college education). A portion of it is reviewed in this paper.

Dissertations

Dissertations are, of course, prepared by graduate students in universities. Many of the students have had junior college experience and a substantial number are working in the field at the time they complete their degree requirements. Most graduate papers report institutional histories or surveys of practices; most fall short of examining, critiquing, or contributing to the concepts on which the community college is based.

Between 1964 and 1968, 428 dissertations on the junior college were completed [11] or in progress [6].* Fewer than 30 per cent of them can be considered as offering generalized (as opposed to parochial) findings. And in fewer than 10 per cent is the methodology experimental or comparative (as opposed to descriptive). The topical thrust favors studies of student characteristics — usually demographic — and reports of administrative procedures. The methodological emphasis is almost exclusively "survey of existing procedures."

Actually, it is unfair to look to dissertations for serious reportage — neither the writers nor the readers expect it. The dissertation allows a student to demonstrate that he knows how to use the tools of education — literature surveys, statements of problems, methodological considerations, and so forth. It enables him to obtain a graduate degree — he rarely expects (or attempts) to solve a real problem or to add to a body of effective critique. The audience for the papers is restricted to professors on the students' graduate committees. Occasionally a student who writes about a problem of particular interest to a single junior college will have his thesis read by top administrators within that institution. However, it is more likely that his work will be perused only by his professors and by other students who wish to "review the literature" — it does not have to stand in a marketplace of ideas.

Accordingly, it is startling when a dissertation that influences policy is found. Mildred Montag's thesis led to a revolution in the teaching of nursing in the community college [9]. James Wattenbarger's dissertation [14] was the foundation for Florida's plan for the establishment and support of community colleges — a plan that has been followed not only in that state but in many others. But these are the exceptions — the

* Numbers in brackets refer to bibliographical entries at the end of the article.

one half of one per cent of the dissertations that comprise a contribution to intelligent argument in the field of education or to the needed dialogue on the idea of the community college. The others remain exercises in demonstrating knowledge of rudimentary research techniques.

As long as narrowly based surveys and parochial histories satisfy the requirements of graduate committees, they will continue to be written to the exclusion of anything of substance. Even if a student and his committee *did* try to come to grips with contemporary issues, the highly stylized, pseudo-scientific, archaic format in which dissertations must be cast would itself squeeze out any commentary, discussion, or free-wheeling speculation. A literature of policy must be sought elsewhere.

Unpublished Reports

The ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information was established in 1966 particularly to bring under bibliographic control the fugitive literature of the junior college field. Because the Clearinghouse particularly sought research reports and definitive statements produced in junior colleges but not widely circulated, the collection built up rapidly to include more than 1,500 such documents. Presidents' reports, self-studies, articulation agreements, institutional research reports, and similar unpublished materials were acquired, indexed, and abstracted.

Few of these documents qualify as reasoned statements of what the junior college is or could be. Most are blatantly egocentric polemics. Self-studies attempt to convince accreditation teams that single colleges are "meeting needs." Articulation agreements list junior college courses acceptable to the university as though the institutions knew full well what students must have in order to learn. Presidents' reports rarely go beyond clichés interwoven among listings of data arranged to show college growth — a phenomenon usually perceived as a virtue in its own right. There are exceptions, however — John Lombardi's annual reports prepared while he was president of Los Angeles City College stand out in particular [7].

Institutional research deserves special comment. Although a sizable minority of the institutions have a person charged with the conduct of research, his efforts are usually directed toward writing proposals for extramural funding or toward gathering data of use in planning facilities and public relations releases. Most research reports involve the checking of records in order to obtain demographic data about students. Frequently, uncontrolled follow-up will be conducted using homemade designs in an effort to determine numbers of students who transfer to four-year institutions, obtain jobs, and so on [13]. Few actual experiments are conducted, even though where they have been, programs based on their findings have been carefully conducted [12].

Junior college research may be summed up in one word—it is inchoate. An intellective curiosity or skepticism regarding modes of organization, results, or effects of instructional programs is not revealed in the reports processed at the Clearinghouse. The audience for indigenous research is the administration and occasionally the faculty of single institutions. It is not likely that topics treated by — or the methodology of — junior college researchers will change until it is beamed at a wider, more critical audience. Avenues of dissemination are not lacking, but realization of the value of, and the need for, substantive writing is.

Journals

The *Junior College Journal* is by far the most important periodical in the field. With close to 40,000 readers, it far outstrips other professional publications designed to appeal particularly to a junior college audience. In fact, the *Journal* and other American Association of Junior Colleges publications, such as *Occupational Education Bulletin* and *Junior College Research Review*, are about the *only* professional education periodicals that reach the desks of many people within the field.

The *Junior College Journal* is written by and for a broad spectrum of people within the profession. A single issue is likely to include articles by faculty members, administrators, professional association representatives, foundation and governmental officials, and university professors with an interest in the field. During the past two years the *Journal* has carried 69 articles by administrators, 27 by instructors, 21 by association representatives, and nine by state officials. Occasional contributors are counselors, librarians, trustees, and others.

The *Journal*, then, is written by its readers' peers. Because it is beamed at such a wide audience, most topics treated within it are of general, widespread interest. The publication has an appealing format and a good balance in articles — two factors that contribute to its broad appeal. It is an effective reporting mechanism for those who would keep current in quotidian trends.

State department or professional association publications typically include within one cover, public relations, news notes, bibliographies, and, on occasion, short, sound treatments of issues of general concern. Notable in the field are North Carolina's *Open Door*, California's *CJCA News*, and Illinois' *Comprehensive Community College Bulletin*. State publications have shown great improvement in content and format during the past few years and more of them will likely be produced. Even now they represent a valuable publications outlet for educators who would take time to write of matters of concern to people beyond the walls of their own institutions.

Currently the journals are a leading forum for those

who speak of junior college trends, criticism, and self-examination. The reader may be forced to mine a ton of overburden before he reaches a nugget, but his efforts will be rewarded. More junior college faculty and staff members should read — and write for — publications within their field.

From time to time, several professional education journals carry articles of potential interest to a junior college audience. Any volume of *Journal of Higher Education, Educational Record, Chronicle of Higher Education, Educational Forum,* or *Teachers College Record* is likely to include at least one piece written by and intended for junior college practitioners. Those journals, however, do not enjoy wide circulation within junior colleges; they are read by professional educators and affiliates. The junior college community could probably support another substantive journal of its own.

Recent Books

Two or three books per year on junior college education have been published over the past several years. The writers of these books vary in terms of professional positions as much as do the audiences for whom the books are intended. Examination of three works published in 1968 will serve to illustrate.

This Is the Community College

Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, wrote *This Is the Community College* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company). Dr. Gleazer is exceptionally well known in the field by virtue of his having headed the major junior college professional association for several years. His book was obviously prepared for an audience that knows little about the institutions as a whole. It was directed toward a lay citizenry with a general concern about community college education and toward people in the profession who had not previously read much about their own institutions.

This Is the Community College reviews the purposes of the institution, the ways in which the college serves a wide variety of people, and the trends in patterns of college organization and financial support. In common with most other writers in the field, Dr. Gleazer starts from the position that opportunity for education beyond the high school must be made available to all. He also recognizes that the community colleges must create unique forms to match the unique tasks it has accepted. These tasks include providing opportunity for continual learning on a dropin/dropout basis, courses that are other than prerequisite to four-year college courses, education that combines the liberal and vocational traditions, and a variety of direct services to the community in which the college is located. He finds the institution "at its best (when) it reaches out to the people who comprise its environment, involves them, identifies with them, is of them and by them" [3:99]. He sees the institution as "an organization not only to achieve educational ends but in that very process to effectuate community improvement" [3:94]. And he finds "courses preparatory to other courses possibly to be taken at some dim future date" to be "a fraud, even if accompanied by the best of intentions" [3:52]. This idea of community outreach is a unifying thread throughout.

If *This Is the Community College* were to be reviewed as a contribution to the knowledge of the serious student of the junior college, it would be found to fall far short. But, if the reader accepts the fact that the book was written for people who have little idea of what the institution is about, it may be seen to have made its own contribution. As AAJC director, Dr. Gleazer receives a substantial number of calls and letters each day by such people and groups; it is for them that the book was written.

Islands of Innovation Expanded

B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education at UCLA, recently completed a book designed for a junior college professional audience. *Islands of Innovation Expanded* [5] is a report of a survey of varied procedures in curriculum and instruction in the junior college. It is a compendious, well-documented statement of the arts and practices of innovation.

In spring 1967, Professor Johnson toured the country, visiting 77 junior colleges in 22 states. As a result of his findings on that trip and in subsequent correspondence, conferences, and meetings with representatives of 182 other junior colleges, he compiled his listings of innovations. The practices are categorized by type — audio-tutorial instruction, programmed instruction, the use of tutors in instruction, and so on. Each category includes a review of the way the practice is utilized in the several junior colleges that have adopted it.

Even though the book is devoted to listings of innovations, a thread of a call for evaluation runs throughout. Professor Johnson recognizes that innovation without assessment of effects is an exercise not likely to lead to instructional improvement, for it is one thing to change a practice and quite another to be able to demonstrate that the change has been for the better.

The author's concern is well founded. Although the ERIC collection includes only a small portion of the research on the junior college, it is representative. But the ERIC holdings include only 75 studies of curriculum and instructional techniques and, of those, only 22 are experimental assessments in which effects of an innovation are compared with conventional media. Seven studies treat television and six assess programmed instruction; the others examine computer-assisted instruction, work-study, large-group instruction, films and course scheduling. Hundreds of

innovative practices have led to only a handful of research reports.

Islands of Innovation Expanded was written for a coterie of what may be called "professional innovators." These include a large number of junior college administrators, a large number (but a small percentage) of instructors, a few state and governmental education officials, a very few university professors, and some college trustees — people concerned with up-to-the-moment patterns of curriculum and instruction in the junior college. There is something to be said for an institution's changing modes of instruction on a regular basis, as a person changes the style or cut of his clothes — it keeps everyone excited and always looking forward to next year's fashions. However, one might hope that those who read the book to find out what is going on in other institutions will realize also that Professor Johnson has made a substantive plea for evaluation, experimentation, and assessment of instructional effect.

Community Colleges: A President's View

A third book on the junior college, written by Thomas E. O'Connell, President of Berkshire Community College (Massachusetts), is a curious piece. *Community Colleges: A President's View* [10] can perhaps be understood best by an attempt to discern its potential audience. The title of the first chapter, "What in the World Is a Community College?" offers a clue: the book may have been written for a group of people who had scarcely heard of the institution — perhaps President O'Connell's colleagues and associates in New England higher education. For, although the community college is quite well known and accepted west of the Connecticut River, if this book is an indication, New Englanders are little aware of the institution, the way it is organized, or its potential. The book may be an attempt to redress the imbalance.

Community Colleges: A President's View includes some rather parochial — not to say naive — views of junior college curriculum and instruction. President O'Connell admits that "about one-third [of the students] flunk or quit the first year" and suggests that "the fact that our attrition at Berkshire is high indicates we're not soft" [10:5]. Granted that it is easier for society to accept students' being flunked out of college than it is for it to allow selective admissions policies, the statement relating attrition to the college's being "not soft" is indeed strange. The implication is that if the college flunked out *two*-thirds of its students it would be *twice* as good. And, *reductio ad absurdum*, if it wiped them all out, it would be perfect! The statement is typical of many in the book that can be understood only in the context of a New England audience that perhaps feels (or is presumed by the author to feel) that community colleges are somehow not quite as "good" as the prestigious private institutions with which that section of the country is blessed.

The book is laced with folksy statements that reveal President O'Connell's perceived need to defend the community college against charges that it is somehow less than higher education. He speaks of "crackerjack" teachers who are able to "make real contact" with students [10:71] and of teachers "of real intellectual bite" [10:81]. Unfortunately, he weakens his case by engaging in a bit of academic snobbery himself, as, for example, when he speaks of the attempts of junior college boards to find holders of doctors' degrees to lead their institutions. "The trouble is, though," he says, "that too often insisting on the doctorate means the college is headed by a Doctor of Education. Perhaps I haven't been looking in the right places, but I have not found many Ed.D. holders who are real intellectuals" [10:127]. Who can improve on that gem?

"Community college people," President O'Connell suggests, "... have a paradoxical combination of pride and diffidence" [10:81]. True. Many writers in the field act as though it is still necessary for them to justify to their colleagues, to the world at large, and indeed to themselves, their working in an institution that is a recent American invention without venerable trappings. One commentator summed it up: "The modern junior college is attempting to define its purposes in accord with a desired status of respectability among other institutions offering college work..." [15:209-210], but he was writing more than 40 years ago! Have we advanced so little since 1928?

Junior college administrators seldom write for publication. When they do, this "proud diffidence" frequently comes through. How much longer will the insecurity of the people who work within the colleges force itself so into their writings that they cannot address themselves to substantive issues? How much longer will the concept of the community college fail to be explored by those who should be concerned with it?

Not enough regarding the *idea* of the community junior college may be found in any of the books cited here. Dr. Gleazer makes such far-reaching statements as, "Nor should anyone delude himself that opportunity consists in simply allowing the student to enter; it involves matching the student with a suitable pattern of learning. If that pattern does not exist, then opportunity does not exist, even if the student is on the registrar's official list" [3:131]. That comment, along with others in the chapter entitled, "Future Development: Concern and Caution," could well be expanded into an entire volume.

Similarly, Professor Johnson's pleas for evaluation are much too important to be hidden among reports of innovative practices, for the casual reader is likely to perceive only the media reports. The idea that the community college will persevere only by demonstrating its effects on students and community should be reiterated until it becomes as much a part of faculty

and staff members' thinking as campuses and course scheduling are now. That these matters are mentioned at all is a strength of the books; that they are not explored in depth is a shortcoming.

General Impressions of the Literature

One journal, a hundred dissertations per year, several hundred indigenous reports ranging from "This is the way we do it at our school" to listings of data gathered for no apparent reason, some articles in journals in the field of education, a few books, and beyond that, miscellaneous state department and professional association papers — this is the literature of the American junior college. It is written by administrators, instructors, university professors, professional association directors, and federal and state officials. It is read by members of those same groups in addition to a few concerned graduate students, board members, and lay citizens. It is a literature that is growing along with the growth of the institution itself as a force in American education. Its topics are practices and programs, procedures and public relations. It is written for a variety of audiences, but certain consistencies may be discerned.

1. A general impression of the literature as a whole is its posture of defensiveness. Repeatedly, in articles and books, in reports for circulation within the institutions, and in releases to the general public, a tone of "We are as good as the university" comes through. This is an understandable tendency for people who must gain support for their efforts to establish a new institution. When junior colleges were a recent phenomenon, their leaders had to trumpet their virtues so that finances would be forthcoming. However, continuing that type of writing to the virtual exclusion of internal criticism and genuine assessment of institutional values must prove untoward in the long run.

2. A second characteristic of the writing in the field is that it views *means* almost to the exclusion of *ends*. Processes, techniques, methods of instruction, and modes of organization are well documented. Much less frequently found, even in the research reports that emanate from the institutions, are statements of the *ends* or *effects* of all those efforts. It is well to communicate regarding professional practices — to share the good news, as it were — but to do that exclusively is to march down a dead-end street.

3. There seems to be general acceptance among those who are writing about the institution that the junior college can do all jobs of community education not currently being handled by the secondary schools or the four-year colleges. Writers seem to have few questions regarding the appropriateness of attempting vocational-technical, general, remedial, college-parallel, and many other types of education within the same institution; discussions regard only techniques and patterns of organizing to do those tasks. There are exceptions, however, and such a well-known figure as Clyde Blocker has suggested that "There are some limitations to the ability of any one organization to handle all social problems" [1:274]. Nevertheless, the wide variety of roles assumed by the community college is usually deemed agreeable. Perhaps if it were questioned more often, junior college educators would be less astonished when other agencies arise, compete for funds, and usurp functions assumed to be properly a part of the college ethos.

4. The question of identity still plagues the community college. It may be related to the fact that an institution that has attempted to do everything finds it difficult to achieve recognition for having done anything. Joseph T. Cosand considers that "By 1980 community colleges will have an identity of their own, based upon solid accomplishments" [2:143], but his statement seems to be based more on wishful thinking than on definite trends. Identity is an elusive, illusory characteristic; its attainment is not a product of dreams.

5. Curiously, many commentators who speak of higher education generally examine the junior college more definitively than do the writers within the field itself. Paul Woodring acknowledges that junior college instruction is of generally high calibre [16], but Jencks and Riesman [4] address themselves particularly to the institutions' impact. They conclude that the junior colleges have made it possible for the publicly supported universities to maintain selective admissions policies without fear of public outrage. Is that all the colleges have been good for? Instead of with answers based on careful reasoning and hard research data, the junior college literature responds with apologies and pleas for recognition. The insecure person must constantly pat himself on the back; the enemies of identity for the junior college may be within the institution itself.

Who Is Talking to Whom?

The times demand dialogue in depth. In education, by the time ideas are transformed into practices, they are usually 50 years past due. Accordingly, the idea of the community college must be continually reexamined to be certain that it remains current. It is incongruous that so few writers address the issues, problems, alternatives, effects, impact, and *raisons d'etre* of the institution in other than platitudinous terms. Specificity is needed — both in the examination of underlying concepts and in the reporting of effectual practices. Only then can the requisite dialogue begin.

These are a few of the issues *not* being discussed in the professional literature: curricular relevance; coexistence of "vocational" and "academic" curriculums; the characteristics of faculty and students as they relate to program effects; institutional flexibility and instructional technology; and, of foremost significance for the decades ahead, whether we are to be satisfied

with equality of *opportunity* or whether we seek some degree of predictable *effect*? There is a gap between the idea of the community college and institutional practices; there is an even wider gap among instructors', administrators', counselors', trustees'—and, yes, university professors'—*perceptions* of the idea.

Educational reform and educational revolution depend on a literature not of propaganda but of policy. As one insightful critic put it, "Literature is the intersection of creativity and criticism, the joint domain of passion and reason" [8:316]. McClellan suggests that, although we may be psychologically "ready for an educational revolution," we are unready politically, because "the issues are unarticulated, the forum not made ready" [8:316-317]. The literature of the junior college fails to contribute to that readiness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

2. Cosand, Joseph T. "The Community College in 1980," in *Campus 1980*. (Edited by Alvin C. Eurich.) New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

3. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. *This Is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

4. Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968.

5. Johnson, B. Lamar. *Islands of Innovation Expanded*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969.

6. Junior College Journal. "Dissertations in Progress." *Junior College Journal*, 39:60-64; September 1968.

7. Lombardi, John. *The State of the College, A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College, 1955-1960, 1962-1965.

8. McClellan, James E. *Toward an Effective Critique of American Education*. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Company, 1968.

9. Montag, Mildred L. *The Education of Nursing Technicians*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1951.

10. O'Connell, Thomas E. *Community Colleges: A President's View*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

11. Roueche, John E. *A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, 1964-1966*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. ED 013 656 (MF - $.25; HC - not available).

12. Roueche, John E., and Boggs, John R. *Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. ED 021 557 (MF - $.50; HC - $3.12).

13. Thomson, Jack. "Institutional Studies of Junior College Students." *Junior College Research Review*. Vol. 1, No. 4, May 1967. ED 013 070 (MF - $.25; HC - $.32).

14. Wattenbarger, James L. *The Organization, Administration, and Financing of Public Junior Colleges in the State of Florida*. Doctoral dissertation. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1950.

15. Whitney, Frederick L. *The Junior College in America*. Greeley: Colorado State Teacher's College, 1928.

16. Woodring, Paul. *The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.

THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER HAS SOMETHING TO SAY

DALE GADDY
University of California, Los Angeles

Although it would be ideal if all junior college administrators, faculty members, and trustees read most of the significant educational research, the truth of the matter is that most probably do not. This is not an indictment of persons associated with junior colleges; rather, it is a statement of belief based on the premises that (1) most junior college professionals do not have — or at least do not take — the time to read available reports, and (2) that the average junior college person has few sources to which he can turn for contemporary reports of research studies.

The daily routines of most administrators and academicians simply leave little time for professional reading. Meeting with a group of militant students, reviewing the annual budget, and preparing lesson plans are only a few tasks that commonly compete for the educator's attention each day. Moreover, other than the *Junior College Journal* and, of late, *Research in Education* (official abstract journal of the ERIC system), there are few publications which the conscientious educator can consult for worthwhile articles or résumés dealing with the junior college. (In fact, these two publications account for less than 700 such reports annually. This is less than one report per year from each existing two-year post-secondary institution in the nation.)

Of those who regularly read research reviews, it may be a safe assumption that most of their reading relates, understandably, to (1) a problem of immediate concern or (2) a subject of continuing interest to them. The focus of the reader's attention is often limited exclusively to one area of research (e.g., a former high school English teacher who, after becoming a junior college instructor, continues to read journals pertaining primarily to secondary English instruction). Few people read research devoted to the broader aspects of the junior college, and even fewer look beyond the junior college field—to other levels of education or to industry or technology—for research that might have implications for the junior college.

In an attempt to illustrate that research designed for problems outside the junior college spectrum does, nonetheless, have implications for the junior college, several persons at the University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education were interviewed with regard to their respective research activities. Excluded from the number were those who reported directly to the junior college. The following is a summary of a portion of activities as revealed in the informal, unstructured conferences and/or as reported in selected writings of each.

Attitudes toward Teachers

During the past decade, M. C. Wittrock has been involved in the assessment of university students' attitudes toward public school teachers. Among other things, he found that freshmen regard teachers rather highly during the first year of college, but that their opinion of teachers drops drastically during the sophomore year. A somewhat higher opinion is recorded during the junior year and the highest level is noted during the senior year.

These findings were based on three studies. The first [17] was conducted in 1962 and involved administering the Semantic Differential technique to 259 UCLA education students. Five factors were identified for interpretation: (1) general evaluation, including such scales as confident-scared, sensible-foolish, energetic-lethargic, and good-bad; (2) restraint, including such scales as reserved-open, introverted-extroverted, restrained-free, and quiet-talkative; (3) tenacity, including such factors as tenacious-yielding, stubborn-yielding, controlled - spontaneous, and rigid - flexible; (4) predictability, including such factors as sober-frivolous, frank - secretive, predictable - unpredictable, and polite-rude; and (5) stability, including such scales as calm-excitable, objective-subjective, stable-changeable, and unemotional-emotional.

Similar results were found in a second study completed in 1964 [16]. In this instance, the same technique was applied to a broader spectrum of students: 178 freshmen, 90 sophomores, 43 juniors, 9 seniors, and 114 graduate students.

Building on the two preceding studies, Wittrock in 1967 completed a third investigation designed to determine whether other variables also affect the factor structure of student responses [15]. Factors such as roles, expressiveness, tenacity, stability, potency, predictability, and evaluation were analyzed. It was concluded that the Semantic Differential should be used as a technique rather than as a test.

Such studies indicate that perhaps junior college personnel also need to be concerned about students' attitudes toward their former school teachers. Such information could enable deans of students and others involved in student personnel services to know more fully the characteristics of the students enrolled at their particular institutions. Moreover, similar studies could be designed to measure student attitudes toward instructors at the junior college itself.

Outcomes of Higher Education

A questionnaire designed to measure the outcomes of higher education as reflected in the behavior of adults and students is currently being distributed nationally by C. Robert Pace. Additionally it is hoped that the study will give an accurate description of the nature of the school and college experience, the characteristics of the institution, and the backgrounds and characteristics of the various respondents. Eleven activity scales pertaining to personal involvement in contemporary society and culture are: community affairs, national and state politics, art, music, literature, drama, education, science, religion, intercultural affairs, and international affairs. As explained in a recent progress report [6]:

> Each scale contains from nine to twelve items. The internal structure of each scale is the same in that it includes a range of activities — from some that are relatively simple, commonplace, and easy to do to ones that involve increasing amounts of interest, time, and commitment. The number of activities checked in each scale provides a measure of the amount and depth of one's participation and interest. The number of different scales in which one checks more than some minimal number of activities provides a measure of the breadth of one's interest and involvement. Other indexes, cutting across scales, can also be derived — such as the number of different fields in which one has read a book, the extent of one's exposure to contemporary works in the arts, an index of community leadership, political activism, etc. The second section of the questionnaire provides a measure of knowledge about certain major changes that are taking place in American society and a measure of attitude toward such changes. These general measures can be further subdivided by topics such as government, industry, the economy, education, environment, etc. The recognition of change and the readiness to deal with it can thus be compared with the denial of change and resistance against it. A third set of criterion measures consists of personal judgments about the extent to which education contributed to various outcomes, and about other values attached to the college experience.

The questionnaire is being distributed to approximately 100 colleges and universities around the country. The institutions vary widely in enrollment and characteristics. No junior college is included in this survey. The questionnaire was mailed in January 1969 to some 22,000 alumni (classes of 1950) of the selected colleges and universities. It was administered to random samples of upperclassmen during February and March and will be administered to freshmen in September 1969. The data will be processed, analyzed, and reported during the next two to three years.

The implications of such a study for the junior college are obvious. Knowing the characteristics of students at all levels of education is of vital significance to educators as they plan and execute the educational programs of their institutions. This is particularly true in the fastest growing segment of American education: the junior college.

Guidelines for Curriculum Evaluation

On the contention that "it has been found essential to apply high standards of professional judgment in selecting, using, and interpreting tests and it is equally essential to apply high standards of professional judgment in selecting and utilizing curriculum and instructional materials," Louise M. Tyler (along with M. Frances Klein) recently developed guidelines for curriculum evaluation, including specifications, rationale, appropriateness, effectiveness, conditions, and practicality [14]. Such an effort was thought particularly worthwhile in view of the recent merging of electronic organizations and publishers, such as IBM with Science Research Associates, RCA with Random House, and CBS with Holt, Rinehart & Winston. This trend has accelerated the centralization of the development of curriculum and instructional materials. Hence, if the materials developed prove to be inadequate, the damage to students could become widespread. This study points out the need for a technical manual to guide persons in making proper evaluations of curriculum materials.

It has been noted elsewhere [7] that every fourth student enrolled in higher education today is a junior or community college student and that "soon all advanced education may start with the community college." This being the case, the junior college, in particular, should be extremely selective in its choice of curriculum materials. A guide such as proposed by Tyler and Klein should be considered carefully by administrators, department chairmen, and faculty members.

Achievement of Mexican-American Students

The use of the English language and the social context of the school are two factors relating to the low aspirations of Mexican-American students as compared with Anglo pupils, according to a 1968 study conducted by C. Wayne Gordon and three other researchers, Audrey J. Schwartz, Robert Wenkert, and David Nasatir [4].

A survey of more than 3,000 sixth-, ninth-, and twelfth-grade students from predominantly Mexican-American areas of Los Angeles showed that (1) the average achievement of Mexican-American pupils is below the average achievement of Anglo pupils from similar socioconomic backgrounds and (2) Mexican-American achievement at all grade levels is substantially below the norm (where national standards are available), while Anglo achievement is at least equal to it.

Achievement factors for both groups included family socioeconomic level, family educational level, affectivity orientations, and school level. "None of these factors," according to the report, "adequately explain[s] the difference between Mexican-American

and Anglo test performances, however, for differences between the achievement of Mexican-American and Anglo pupils are substantially reduced only in comparisons of performance within one group of pupils — the junior high school white collar pupils — with controls for either home language or for school context."

The study indicates that the proportion of Anglo pupils who aspire to post-secondary education is almost twice that of Mexican-Americans.

The authors point out that "Even so, in absolute terms, the aspirations of Mexican-Americans are much higher than public stereotype might suggest. Attributing the low achievement of Mexican-Americans to lack of motivation is probably incorrect."

The highest achievers among Mexican-American pupils are those who have been most thoroughly socialized to the dominant American culture, according to this report.

The data, acquired from a questionnaire circulated to each of the pupils and from cumulative school records, were cross-tabulated to compare and to explain differences in the two groups' performances. Also a stepwise multiple regression was computed to find out the strength of the association between the level of the two groups' performances and the association of selected pupils and school factors to that level of performance. The fact that all of the students surveyed were from the same general areas of the city narrowed the range of difference between the two groups. Attention was focused on family background, pupil characteristics, use of the Spanish language, educational materials in the home, educational aspirations, occupational aspirations, and values and attitudes about school, family, strangers, self, and the future.

A general conclusion reached by the authors was that "Achievement results essentially when family values and school contexts are mutually supportive."

Junior college administrators might well be concerned with similar studies at their own institutions. If the junior college is, indeed, the best institution to help solve the problems of minority groups (as some maintain), it should examine its procedures for attracting students and should, if necessary, make adjustments in its recruitment of minority students. Deans of instruction, in particular, might wish to spearhead a study similar to the one described above in order to more ably devise or revise curricula so that minority students can take their place in society among other degree holders. How many minority students take advantage of the "second chance" offered by the junior college?

Testing Teacher Proficiency

A performance test of teaching proficiency has been developed by W. James Popham and Eva L. Baker [8]. It was designed as a means of evaluating teacher success on the basis of pupil growth rather than on the more general basis of classroom observation (where attention often is devoted solely to the instructional means employed by the teacher instead of the ends that the teacher is trying to achieve). The basic assumption of this study was that "the teacher who is the better achiever of given instructional goals will, other factors being relatively equal, be the better achiever of his own goals."

In this instance, a social science performance test was developed, administered, and reported. The 26-page unit consisted of 13 specific objectives, content guidelines, and a set of resources. The 13 teachers selected for the experiment were all regular San Diego City Schools employees; the 13 nonteachers were upper-division female college students from San Diego State College. The twelfth-grade social studies students were regular summer-school students, most of whom were enrolled for the first time in a government class.

The study took place during a one-week period of summer school. Each regular teacher retained half of her class; the other half was assigned to a nonteacher. The division was made on a purely random selection. Instruction was given during the hours of 8 to 12 a.m. At the conclusion of the experiment, a 40-minute test was administered to the pupils.

The data indicated that the regular teachers did not perform better than the nonteachers, although the contrary had been predicted at the outset of the experiment. As explained by the researchers, "Experienced teachers are not experienced at bringing about intentional behavior changes in learners." They hastened to point out that, because teachers have not been trained to be skilled goal achievers and since no premium is placed on such instructional skill either by the general public or by the schools, the finding cited above should not be interpreted as an assault on the teaching profession.

The authors suggest other possible studies, including the following, which could be performed as easily and as meaningfully at the junior college level as at any other level of education: a construct validation effort based on a contrast between (1) instructors who had manifested measurable skill in promoting learner attainment of prespecified objectives and (2) instructors who had not manifested such skill. As phrased by Popham and Baker, "... to the extent that the performance test strategy focuses the attention of educators on the *ends* of instruction (i.e., post-instruction behavior changes in learners), rather than instructional *means* (i.e., teaching procedures) its ultimate impact should clearly be beneficial." This is an issue of great consequence to the junior college — itself a "teaching institution."

Conclusions

All of the matters presented above are related to junior college education. Many are being studied by the Clearinghouse, and, in some instances, designs for further research are being developed. With respect to attitudes toward teachers, the Clearinghouse's topical paper number two* deals with the matter of assessing student attitudes [1]; four steps in the construction of an attitude scale are presented and could easily be used in a study similar to those of Wittrock's and Husek's. Also, the March 1968 issue of the *Junior College Research Review* was a summary of recent research on junior college teachers, including student ratings of their instructors [12].

Several other issues of the *Junior College Research Review* have dealt with some of the areas reported above. For instance, the assessment of junior college environments was treated in the December 1968 issue [5]; in April 1967, attention was devoted to junior college curriculum studies [13]; the November 1967 issue focused on remedial programs at the junior college level [9]; and the topic of entrance and placement testing was reviewed in the January 1968 issue [11].

Additionally, three monographs published by the Clearinghouse in conjunction with the American Association of Junior Colleges deal with at least two of the areas reported here. One, while not discussing minority students *per se*, relates to remedial education — a topic of great significance to all educationally-deprived persons [10]. Two other monographs regard personality characteristics of faculty members [2] and the measurement of faculty performance [3].

No doubt other university schools of education are doing similar studies. They will be reported here as they are received and processed for ERIC.

* Note the list of available Clearinghouse publications presented on pages 13-15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Boggs, John R., and Herrscher, Barton R. *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education, Number 2: Attitude Assessment.* Los Angeles: University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, November 1968.

2. Brawer, Florence B. *Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, November 1968.

3. Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B. *Measuring Faculty Performance.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, January 1969.

4. Gordon, C. Wayne, and others. *Educational Achievement and Aspiration of Mexican-American Youth in a Metropolitan Context.* Occasional Report No. 36. Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, October 1968.

5. Herrscher, Barton R. "The Assessment of Junior College Environments." *Junior College Research Review,* Vol. 3, No. 4, December 1968.

6. Pace, C. Robert. "Progress Report of Activities Related to Higher Education, September 1967 to October 1968." Los Angeles: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, 1968.

7. "Planning the Community College," *College and University Business,* 43:57-68; October 1967. ED 017 249 (MF - $.25; HC - $.80).

8. Popham, W. James, and Baker, Eva L. "Validation Results: A Performance Test of Teaching Proficiency." (A paper presented at the Annual American Educational Research Association Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February 7-10, 1968.)

9. Roueche, John E. "The Junior College Remedial Program." *Junior College Research Review,* Vol. 2, No. 3, November 1967. ED 013 661 (MF - $.25; HC - $.32).

10. Roueche, John E. *Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, February 1968. ED 019 077 (MF - $.50; HC - $3.16).

11. Roueche, John E., and Boggs, John R. "Entrance and Placement Testing." *Junior College Research Review,* Vol. 2, No. 5, January 1968. ED 014 991 (MF - $.25; HC - $.32).

12. Roueche, John E., and Hurlburt, Allan S. "Research on Junior College Teachers." *Junior College Research Review,* Vol. 2, No. 7, March 1968. ED 021 540 (MF - $.25; HC - $.24).

13. Roueche, John E., and Sims, David M. "Curriculum Studies in the Junior College." *Junior College Research Review,* Vol. 1, No. 3, April 1967. ED 013 069 (MF - $.25; HC - $.32).

14. Tyler, Louise L., and Klein, M. Frances. *Recommendations for Curriculum and Instructional Materials.* Los Angeles: University of California, 1967.

15. Wittrock, M. C. "The Connotative Meaning of the Concept 'Public School Teachers': An Image Analysis of Semantic Differential Data." *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 27:863-869; Winter 1967.

16. Wittrock, M. C. "The Connotative Meaning of Concepts: Teachers and Children." *California Journal of Educational Research,* 15:60-67; March 1964.

17. Wittrock, M. C., and Husek, T. R. "The Dimensions of Attitudes toward Teachers as Measured by the Semantic Differential." *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 53:209-213; October 1962.

PUBLICATIONS LIST

The ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information has three publication series in addition to the *Junior College Research Review:* (1) monographs — periodic in-depth studies and interpretations of research on topics related to the junior college; (2) topical papers — occasional statements on pertinent junior college topics and issues; and (3) bibliographies relating to the junior college.

The following is a list of available publications. Shown in each category is the retail price (if any) of each entry, source for ordering, and, if available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, the ED number and price for microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC) reproductions.

MONOGRAPHS

All Clearinghouse monographs are published by and available from the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

No. 1 *Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Junior College,* February 1968. 77 p. Price $2. ED 019 077 (MF - $.50; HC - $3.16).

This first comprehensive report on the effectiveness of junior colleges in educating the disadvantaged, low-aptitude student reveals that even though most community colleges agree with the open-door concept, only about half provide remedial instruction. While revealing a severe lack of agreement on objectives of remedial programs and showing that existing programs are based on unproved assumptions rather than on research findings, the author presents some revolutionary approaches and examples of colleges that are departing from traditional practices in remedial education.

No. 2 *Junior College Institutional Research: State of the Art,* Summer 1968. 76 p. Price $2. ED 021 557 (MF - $.50; HC - $3.12).

Interviews, plus 28 studies from 70 junior colleges, reveal current research on student characteristics, faculty, instruction, curriculum, services, operations, and testing. Approaches were observational studies, group comparisons, and correlation for prediction and counseling. Comments and recommendations are made regarding methodology and results. Research and institutional evaluation are the president's responsibility.

No. 3 *Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Junior College,* November 1968. 89 p. Price $2.

Viewing the community college as a teaching rather than research-oriented institution, the author analyzes materials that can assist in the selection and placement of junior college faculty and help people involved in the junior college movement to know better what they, personally, and the movement are about. Twenty recommendations are made to specific levels of administration, faculty, and student groups.

No. 4 *Measuring Faculty Performance,* February 1969. Price $2.

This is an examination of practices of teacher evaluation at several levels of education, particularly the junior college. The authors reached the conclusion that, as currently practiced, teacher evaluation is a futile exercise. They make recommendations for abandoning teacher evaluation and replacing it with other measures of faculty performance that may have more value or significance.

No. 5 *Institutional Administrator or Educational Leader? The Junior College President,* February 1969. Price $2.

The role of the college president as an educational leader and agent of change is presented in this publication. Contending that the president should be more than a mere institutional manager, the authors urge the president to ask the right questions about his institution's educational program. The study is based, in part, on a random sample of 10 per cent of the 912 existing community and junior colleges in 1968.

No. 6 *Student Activism in Junior Colleges,* April 1969. Price $2.

This is an overview of all forms of student activism, its causes, and responses to it. Included are such groups as the New Left, Black Power, Mexican-Americans, rightists, student body officers, and others. The history of the student rights movement is traced from the Free Speech Movement to the present.

No. 7 *The Multi-Institution Junior College District,* April 1969. Price $2.

Noting that multi-campus junior college districts have begun appearing at unprecedented rates during the 1960's, the authors devote attention primarily to clarifying the relationship between the district office and the colleges within the district. An examination of the theoretical bases of this type of administration is made; authority in the areas of instruction, staff, personnel, student services, business, and other administrative services is studied; case studies of five districts are made; and guidelines and recommendations are presented.

TOPICAL PAPERS

A limited supply of each topical paper is available free of charge from the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information.

No. 1 *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education.* 35 p. ED 022 479 (MF - $.25; HC - $1.48).

This contains some simple, practical research procedures for analyzing remedial-student characteristics. Data can be gathered to answer questions on interrelationships of motivation, performance, effectiveness of instruction, etc. Complete instructions are included for selecting students, administering tests, calculating statistics, and drawing inferences from findings.

No. 2 *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education, Number 2: Attitude Assessment.* 17 p.

This, the second in a series of research plans for studying junior college remedial education, is a schéme to develop a scale for measuring student attitudes. The four steps in constructing the scale are described in detail, as well as the use of the scale for other groups such as parents, teachers, and vocational students.

No. 3 *Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines.* 47 p.

This analysis of student activism, militancy, or agitation presents specific examples, court decisions, general principles derived from these specifics, and recommendations for administrators and students concerned about the legal status of their behavior.

No. 4 *Students as Teachers.* 11 p.

This, the fourth in a series presenting paradigms for studying the effects of changed practices in junior colleges, offers a unique strategy for changing student attitudes. Presented in simple form is a rationale for teachers to use in designing learning activities that deliberately capitalize on the effects upon students of their attempts to teach (or otherwise influence) other students. Detailed instructions and procedures are included for three different models.

No. 5 *Is Anyone Learning to Write?*

This is a simple, easy-to-use research scheme to measure change in student composition writing. It is a pre- and post-test design, and complete instructions are included for selecting participants, developing a scoring key, checking reliability, choosing topics, implementing the study, etc.

No. 6 *Is It Really a Better Technique?* (Procedures for comparing the performance of two groups), 1969.

This is a rationale and a simplified procedure for statistically evaluating instruction. It is aimed at the full-time junior college teacher interested in comparing the performances of two groups of students (e.g., day vs. evening) who have been exposed to the same instruction. Clear step-by-step procedures are given using different subject-matter examples.

No. 7 *A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education, Number 3: Concept Formation,* 1969.

This, the third in a series of research plans for studying junior college remedial education, is a rationale and simple procedure for modifying instruction to promote concept formation in the less able student. Included are (1) a realistic description of how learners form concepts, (2) an example of instructional activities to promote concept learning, and (3) a scheme to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction. This plan, like the others in the series, is intended for use by junior college teachers interested in remedial education but lacking simple effective instruments to accomplish it.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The Junior and Community College: A Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, November 1967. Available from the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 24 p. Price $1. ED 013 656 (MF - $.25; HC - not available).

Compiled for the American Association of Junior Colleges, this bibliography lists 214 doctoral dissertations about the junior college, completed between 1964 and 1966. The dissertations are listed by author, subject, and institutional source.

The Junior and Community College Faculty: A Bibliography, 1968. Available from the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. 20 p. Price $1. ED 016 490 (MF - $.25; HC - not available).

Here are 186 documents, published since 1962, concerning junior and community college teachers, listed by author and cross-indexed under 66 subject headings. Topics include teacher characteristics, preparation, evaluation, salaries, and working conditions. Not included are materials specifically related to processes or methods of teaching.

The College President — A Bibliography (with annotations on the junior college presidency). Available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. 16 p. ED 019 966 (MF - $.25; HC - $.72).

Seventy general references and 24 document reviews specifically related to the junior and community college presidency are listed here. They indicate that increasing numbers of incumbents came from areas other than higher education and that the office is the most influential change agent in the institution. Workshop and institute proceedings are included.

Counseling and Guidance in the Junior College: A Bibliography. Available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. 16 p. ED 022 452 (MF - $.25; HC - $.72).

Listed here are 163 documents published since 1955 concerning junior college counseling and guidance. They reveal "student-centered" institutions servicing learners who vary widely in ability, achievement, vocational goals, motivation, and age. Institutional goals focus on providing educational opportunities for all people via effective counseling and guidance.

DETACH AND MAIL

MONOGRAPHS

To: **Publications Department**
American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

From: (Name)_____
(Title)_____
(Institution)_____
(City, State, Zip)_____

Enclosed is a check for_____in payment for monograph number(s)_____ at $2.00 each.

**All orders of less than $5 must be prepaid.*

TOPICAL PAPERS

To: **ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information**
96 Powell Library
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024

From: (Name)_____
(Title)_____
(Institution)_____
(City, State, Zip)_____

Please send one copy of topical paper number(s)_____. I understand that a limited supply of copies is available at no cost to the inquirer.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

(Address inquiry to appropriate organization as designated in the list of bibliographies.)

To: _____

From: (Name)_____
(Title)_____
(Institution)_____
(City, State, Zip)_____

Please send_____copies of the bibliography entitled_____
_____Enclosed is a check for_____

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

To: **American Association of Junior Colleges**
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

From: (Name)_____
(Title)_____
(Institution)_____
(City, State, Zip)_____

Enclosed is payment for_____subscriptions at $2.00 each (10 issues).
NOTE: AAJC institutional members, institutional associates, and individual members will receive one free subscription as part of their membership dues.

Abstracts of documents processed in the ERIC system may be found in *Research in Education*, a publication of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Research in Education* may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

(Single copy, $1.75, annual subscription of 12 issues, $21.00.)

All ERIC documents are available (in microfiche or hard copy) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Research in Education is cumulated annually and semi-annually: RIE Semi-Annual Index, January-June, 1968. This index, used in conjunction with the 1967 RIE Annual Indexes, offers the most complete and comprehensive search tool for retrieving reports that have been announced in *Research in Education* since the first issue was published in November 1966.

The *Junior College Research Review* is published ten times per academic year. Subscriptions are available at $2.00 each from AAJC, 1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

ARTHUR M. COHEN, *Director and Principal Investigator*

LORRAINE MATHIES, *Co-Investigator*

LOUIS W. BENDER
Chairman, Council of State Directors
of Community Junior Colleges

SIDNEY BROSSMAN
Chancellor
California Community Colleges

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

C. WAYNE GORDON
Associate Dean
Graduate School of Education, UCLA

ROBERT M. HAYES
Professor, School of Library Science, UCLA
Director, Institute of Library Research

B. LAMAR JOHNSON
Professor of Higher Education
UCLA

JOHN LOMBARDI
Assistant Superintendent, Junior Colleges
Los Angeles City Schools

LLOYD MESSERSMITH
Executive Director
California Junior College Association

LOUIS C. RIESS
President, California Junior College
Faculty Association, Inc.

JOHN E. ROUECHE
Regional Education Laboratory for
the Carolinas and Virginia

ROBERT VOSPER
University Librarian
UCLA

JAMES L. WATTENBARGER
Director, Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW
Arthur M. Cohen, Editor
Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
Room 96, Powell Library
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
PERMIT NO. 12378

3/8